

**IN THE SPECIFICATION**

The specification is objected as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter regarding. The Office Action submits that in claim 13 “machine-readable medium” has insufficient antecedent basis.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the Office Action’s rejection because the meaning of “machine-readable medium” is not unclear. According to the MPEP, “the failure to provide explicit antecedent basis for terms does not always render a claim indefinite. If the scope of a claim would be reasonably ascertainable by those skilled in the art, then the claim is not indefinite.”<sup>1</sup>

The Applicants respectfully submit “machine-readable medium” is clear in the context of the specification, which references “storage mediums” (paragraphs 34, 43, 44 and 54) and “a personal computer on which file-sharing software 201 is running.” (See FIG. 2 and paragraph 33).

Thus, the Applicants respectfully request that the objection under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Energizer Holdings Inc. v. Int’l Trade Comm’n*, 435 F.3d 1366, 77 USPQ2d 1625 (Fed. Cir. 2006).” (MPEP. 2173.05(e)).